

REMARKS

The Office Action rejected claims 1-4, 9-12 and 15-18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,279,030 ("Britton"). The Office Action also rejected claims 5-8, 13-14 and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Britton. In this reply, while applicant does not agree with the arguments advanced in the Office Action as applicant has explained in the response to the first Office Action, independent claims 1, 9 and 15 are being amended to recite, "enabling the client to communicate with a different server that is using a different version of the first network application and allowing the client to download the different version of the same first network application from the different server, wherein the client is allowed to communicate simultaneously with one or more different servers even if the different servers are running different versions of the same first network application" to further clarify what is being claimed. Support for the amendment can be found at least in paragraphs 0013 and 0015 of the original specification.

As understood by applicant, the cited passages of Britton teach dynamically downloading class files as the application program is executed by a JVM on a client computer (see Britton, Col 7, line 59 – Col. 8, line 11). Britton, however, as understood by applicant, does not appear to disclose or suggest that a client may download different versions of the same application from different servers and communicate substantially simultaneously with different servers, that is, during at least in part overlapping sessions with different servers. Rather, Britton appears to suggest that different clients can download different versions of components appropriate for that client from a server. In its disclosure, Britton provides a user interface component in its mortgage calculator application as an example. According to Britton, different versions of user interface component may be downloaded from the server to accommodate the different computer

monitor attributes on different clients. This is different from what is claimed in independent Claims 1, 9 and 15 as amended, which recites that a single client may download and run different versions of the same application to communicate with different servers.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that Britton does not disclose, teach or suggest the subject matter recited in Applicant's independent claims 1, 9 and 15.

Claims 2-8, 10-14, 16-20 depend from independent claims 1, 9 and 15. Therefore, by virtue of their dependencies, Britton also does not disclose, teach or suggest the subject matter recited in those claims for at least the same reason provided for the independent claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration, withdrawal of all rejections, and allowance of all pending claims in due course.

Respectfully submitted,



Eunhee Park
Registration No. 42, 976

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser, P.C.
400 Garden City Plaza, Suite 300
Garden City, N.Y. 11530
(516) 742-4343

EP:me